

**7/21/77 [1]**

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 7/21/77  
[1]; Container 32

To See Complete Finding Aid:

[http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff\\_Secretary.pdf](http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff_Secretary.pdf)

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE

Thursday - July 21, 1977

---

7:30 Breakfast with Vice President Walter F. Mondale, Secretary Cyrus Vance, and Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski - The Roosevelt Room.

8:30 Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski - The Oval Office.

9:00 Mr. Frank Moore - The Oval Office.

9:15  
(10 min.) Congressman Parren Mitchell. (Mr. Frank Moore).  
The Oval Office.

10:00  
(10 min.) Greet Future Farmers of America Group.  
(Ms. Midge Costanza) - The Rose Garden.

10:30 Mr. Jody Powell - The Oval Office.

12:25 Depart South Grounds via Helicopter en route Andrews Air Force Base, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

SOUTHERN LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE SPEECH

Charleston, South Carolina  
Thursday, July 21, 1977

SOUTHERN LEGISLATIVE  
CONFERENCE SPEECH  
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA  
JULY 21, 1977

BILLY  
PLAINS  
ROOM

SEN HOLLINGS - STENNIS EASTLAND - GOV EDWARDS  
CHMN BRAGG  
→ GA Legis - GOV of GA  
~~BED on fire~~  
OWNER'S MANUAL - JAWORSKI - LEAVE TOWN  
BILLY - COULDN'T AFFORD

PROUD TO BE AMERICAN/SOUTHERNER  
I AM PROUD TO MEET WITH YOU TODAY,  
HERE IN ONE OF THE MOST GRACIOUS OF  
OUR NATION'S CITIES, TO TALK ABOUT  
THE PROBLEMS AND THE HOPES THAT WE,  
AS SOUTHERNERS AND AS AMERICANS,  
ALL SHARE.

I FEEL A SPECIAL KINSHIP WITH YOU  
AS STATE LEGISLATORS. FOR FOUR YEARS  
I WAS A MEMBER OF THE GEORGIA STATE  
SENATE, AND I

SENATE, AND I STILL PRIZE STATE  
GOVERNMENT NOT ONLY FOR THE TALENTS  
OF THOSE WHO WORK IN IT, BUT FOR ITS  
CLOSENESS TO THE PEOPLE IT REPRESENTS.  
OUR SOUTHERN STATES HAVE A PROUD  
TRADITION OF LOCAL, INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT,  
OF WHICH YOU ARE NOW THE HEIRS.

BUT WE IN THE SOUTH HAVE ALSO FELT,  
PERHAPS MORE DIRECTLY THAN MANY OTHERS,  
SOME OF THE RAPID CHANGES OF THE MODERN  
AGE. MORE AND MORE OUR DAILY LIVES  
ARE SHAPED BY EVENTS IN OTHER CITIES,  
DECISIONS IN OTHER STATES, TENSIONS  
IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD. AS

AMERICANS,

AMERICANS, WE CANNOT OVERLOOK THE WAY  
OUR FATE IS BOUND TO THAT OF OTHER  
NATIONS. THIS INTERDEPENDENCE STRETCHES  
FROM THE HEALTH OF OUR ECONOMY TO THE  
SECURITY OF OUR ENERGY SUPPLIES. IT IS  
A NEW WORLD, IN WHICH WE CANNOT AFFORD  
TO BE NARROW IN OUR VISION, LIMITED  
IN OUR FORESIGHT, OR SELFISH IN OUR  
PURPOSE.

WHEN I TOOK OFFICE, OUR NATION  
WAS FACING A SERIES OF PROBLEMS AROUND  
THE WORLD -- IN SOUTHERN AFRICA, THE  
MIDDLE EAST, IN OUR RELATIONS WITH OUR  
NATO ALLIES, AND ON SUCH TOUGH QUESTIONS

AS NUCLEAR

4

AS NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION, NEGOTIATIONS  
WITH OUR FORMER ADVERSARIES, A PANAMA  
CANAL TREATY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND WORLD  
POVERTY. WE HAVE OPENLY AND PUBLICLY  
ADDRESSED THESE AND OTHER DIFFICULT  
AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES -- SOME OF  
WHICH HAVE BEEN SKIRTED OR AVOIDED  
IN THE PAST. AS I POINTED OUT IN MY  
MOST RECENT PRESS CONFERENCE, A PERIOD  
OF DEBATE, DISAGREEMENT AND PROBING  
WAS INEVITABLE. OUR GOAL HAS NOT  
BEEN TO REACH EASY OR TRANSIENT  
AGREEMENTS, BUT TO FIND SOLUTIONS  
THAT ARE MEANINGFUL, BALANCED, AND  
LASTING.

A PRESIDENT HAS A RESPONSIBILITY  
TO PRESENT TO THE PEOPLE REPORTS  
AND SUMMATIONS OF COMPLEX AND  
IMPORTANT MATTERS. TODAY I WANT TO  
DISCUSS A VITALLY IMPORTANT ASPECT  
OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS, THE ONE THAT  
MAY MOST DIRECTLY SHAPE THE CHANCES  
FOR PEACE FOR US AND FOR OUR CHILDREN.  
I WOULD LIKE TO SPELL OUT MY VIEW OF  
WHAT WE HAVE DONE AND WHERE WE ARE  
GOING IN OUR RELATIONS WITH THE  
SOVIET UNION AND TO REAFFIRM THE  
BASIC PRINCIPLES OF OUR NATIONAL POLICY.

FOR DECADES, THE CENTRAL PROBLEMS  
OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY REVOLVED AROUND  
ANTAGONISM

ANTAGONISM BETWEEN TWO COALITIONS,  
ONE HEADED BY THE UNITED STATES AND  
THE OTHER BY THE SOVIET UNION. OUR  
NATIONAL SECURITY WAS DEFINED ALMOST  
EXCLUSIVELY IN TERMS OF MILITARY  
COMPETITION WITH THE USSR.

THIS COMPETITION IS STILL CRITICAL,  
BECAUSE IT DOES INVOLVE ISSUES WHICH  
COULD LEAD TO WAR. BUT HOWEVER  
IMPORTANT THIS RELATIONSHIP OF  
MILITARY BALANCE, IT CANNOT BE OUR  
SOLE PREOCCUPATION, TO THE EXCLUSION  
OF OTHER WORLD ISSUES WHICH ALSO  
CONCERN US BOTH.

1

EVEN IF WE SUCCEED IN RELAXING  
TENSIONS WITH THE USSR, WE COULD STILL  
AWAKE ONE DAY TO FIND THAT NUCLEAR  
WEAPONS HAVE SPREAD TO DOZENS OF  
OTHER NATIONS. OR WE COULD STRUGGLE  
TO LIMIT THE ARSENALS OF OUR TWO  
NATIONS, TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF WAR,  
ONLY TO UNDO OUR EFFORTS BY CONTINUING  
WITHOUT RESTRAINT TO EXPORT ARMAMENTS  
AROUND THE WORLD. AS TWO INDUSTRIAL  
GIANTS, WE FACE LONG-TERM ENERGY  
CRISES. WHATEVER OUR POLITICAL  
DIFFERENCES, BOTH OF US ARE COMPELLED  
TO BEGIN CONSERVING WORLD ENERGY  
SUPPLIES AND DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVES

TO OIL

TO OIL AND GAS. DESPITE DEEP AND  
CONTINUING DIFFERENCES IN WORLD  
OUTLOOK, BOTH OF US SHOULD ACCEPT  
THE NEW RESPONSIBILITIES IMPOSED ON  
US BY THE CHANGING NATURE OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

[~~OTHER GREAT CHANGES HAVE~~  
~~TRANSFORMED THE NATURE OF THE~~  
~~INTERNATIONAL DRAMA.~~] EUROPE AND  
JAPAN ROSE FROM THE RUBBLE OF WAR  
TO BECOME GREAT ECONOMIC POWERS.  
COMMUNIST PARTIES AND GOVERNMENTS  
BECAME MORE WIDESPREAD AND MORE VARIED.  
NEWLY INDEPENDENT NATIONS EMERGED  
INTO WHAT HAS BECOME KNOWN AS THE

9

THIRD WORLD. THEIR ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS IS BECOMING INCREASINGLY SIGNIFICANT. ~~[AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL GENIUS OF MANKIND GAVE US THE MEANS OF BRINGING THE WORLD'S PEOPLES CLOSER TOGETHER, AND ALSO EVER MORE SOPHISTICATED AND PROLIFIC WEAPONS OF DESTRUCTION.]~~

BOTH THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION HAVE LEARNED THAT OUR COUNTRIES AND OUR PEOPLES, IN SPITE OF GREAT RESOURCES, ARE NOT ALL POWERFUL. WE HAVE LEARNED THAT THIS WORLD, NO MATTER HOW TECHNOLOGY HAS SHRUNK ITS DISTANCES, IS NEVERTHELESS

TOO LARGE

TOO LARGE AND TOO VARIED TO COME  
UNDER THE SWAY OF EITHER ONE OR TWO  
SUPER POWERS. AND -- WHAT IS PERHAPS  
MOST IMPORTANT -- WE HAVE, FOR OUR  
PART, LEARNED ALL OF THIS IN A SPIRIT  
NOT OF INCREASING RESIGNATION BUT  
OF INCREASING MATURITY.

I MENTION THESE FAMILIAR CHANGES  
BECAUSE I THINK THAT TO UNDERSTAND  
TODAY'S SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIP  
WE MUST PLACE IT IN PERSPECTIVE, BOTH  
HISTORICALLY AND IN TERMS OF THE  
OVERALL GLOBAL SCENE.

THE WHOLE HISTORY OF SOVIET-  
AMERICAN RELATIONS TEACHES US THAT

WE WILL BE MISLED IF WE BASE OUR  
LONG-RANGE POLICIES ON THE MOOD OF  
THE MOMENT, WHETHER THAT MOOD IS  
EUPHORIC OR GRIM. ALL OF US CAN  
REMEMBER TIMES WHEN RELATIONS SEEMED  
ESPECIALLY DANGEROUS AND TIMES WHEN  
THEY SEEMED BRIGHT. WE HAVE CROSSED  
THOSE PEAKS AND VALLEYS BEFORE. AND WE  
CAN SEE THAT, ON BALANCE, THE TREND  
IN THE LAST THIRD OF A CENTURY HAS  
BEEN POSITIVE.

THE PROFOUND DIFFERENCES IN WHAT  
OUR TWO GOVERNMENTS BELIEVE ABOUT

FREEDOM

FREEDOM AND POWER AND THE INNER LIVES  
OF HUMAN BEINGS ARE LIKELY TO REMAIN,  
AND SO ARE OTHER ELEMENTS OF COMPETITION  
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE  
SOVIET UNION. THAT COMPETITION IS  
REAL AND DEEPLY ROOTED IN THE HISTORY  
AND VALUES OF OUR RESPECTIVE SOCIETIES.  
BUT IT IS ALSO TRUE THAT OUR TWO  
COUNTRIES SHARE MANY IMPORTANT  
OVERLAPPING INTERESTS. OUR JOB IS TO  
EXPLORE THOSE INTERESTS AND USE THEM  
TO ENLARGE THE AREAS OF COOPERATION  
BETWEEN US, ON A BASIS OF EQUALITY  
AND MUTUAL RESPECT.

AS WE NEGOTIATE WITH THE SOVIET  
UNION, WE WILL BE GUIDED BY A VISION --

OF A GENTLER, FREER, MORE BOUNTIFUL  
WORLD. BUT WE WILL HAVE NO ILLUSIONS  
ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE WORLD AS IT  
REALLY IS. THE BASIS FOR COMPLETE  
MUTUAL TRUST DOES NOT YET EXIST.  
THEREFORE THE AGREEMENTS WE REACH  
MUST BE ANCHORED ON EACH SIDE IN  
ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST. THAT IS  
WHY WE SEARCH FOR AREAS OF AGREEMENT  
WHERE OUR REAL INTERESTS AND THOSE  
OF THE SOVIETS COINCIDE.

WE WANT TO SEE THE SOVIETS  
FURTHER ENGAGED IN THE GROWING PATTERN  
OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES DESIGNED  
TO DEAL WITH HUMAN PROBLEMS -- NOT ONLY

BECAUSE THEY

BECAUSE THEY CAN BE OF REAL HELP,  
BUT ALSO BECAUSE WE BOTH SHOULD HAVE  
A GREATER STAKE IN THE CREATION OF  
A CONSTRUCTIVE AND PEACEFUL WORLD  
ORDER.

WHEN I TOOK OFFICE -- EXACTLY  
SIX MONTHS AGO -- MANY AMERICANS  
WERE GROWING DISILLUSIONED WITH  
DETENTE -- AND, BY EXTENSION, WITH  
THE WHOLE COURSE OF OUR RELATIONS  
WITH THE SOVIET UNION. WORLD RESPECT  
FOR THE ESSENTIAL RIGHTNESS OF OUR  
FOREIGN POLICY HAD BEEN SHAKEN BY THE  
EVENTS OF A DECADE. AT THE SAME TIME,  
WE WERE BEGINNING TO REGAIN OUR SENSE  
OF CONFIDENCE AND PURPOSE AS A NATION.

IN THIS SITUATION, I DECIDED  
THAT IT WAS TIME FOR HONEST  
DISCUSSIONS ABOUT INTERNATIONAL  
ISSUES WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.  
I FELT IT WAS URGENT TO RESTORE THE  
MORAL BEARINGS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN  
POLICY. AND I FELT THAT IT WAS  
IMPORTANT TO PUT THE U.S.-SOVIET  
RELATIONSHIP, IN PARTICULAR, ON A  
MORE RECIPROCAL, REALISTIC, AND  
ULTIMATELY MORE PRODUCTIVE BASIS  
FOR BOTH NATIONS. IT IS NOT A QUESTION  
OF A ''HARD'' POLICY OR A ''SOFT''  
POLICY, BUT OF A CLEAR-EYED  
RECOGNITION OF HOW MOST EFFECTIVELY  
TO PROTECT OUR

TO PROTECT OUR SECURITY AND TO  
CREATE THE KIND OF INTERNATIONAL  
ORDER I HAVE JUST DESCRIBED. THIS  
IS OUR GOAL.

WE HAVE LOOKED AT THE PROBLEMS  
IN SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS FRESHLY,  
AND HAVE SOUGHT TO DEAL WITH THEM  
BOLDLY AND CONSTRUCTIVELY WITH  
PROPOSALS INTENDED TO PRODUCE CONCRETE  
RESULTS:

-- IN THE TALKS ON STRATEGIC ARMS  
LIMITATIONS, WE ADVANCED A COMPREHENSIVE  
PROPOSAL FOR GENUINE REDUCTIONS,  
LIMITATIONS, AND A FREEZE ON NEW

TECHNOLOGY WHICH WOULD MAINTAIN  
BALANCED STRATEGIC STRENGTH.

-- WE HAVE URGED A COMPLETE END  
TO ALL NUCLEAR TESTS AND THESE  
NEGOTIATIONS ARE NOW UNDERWAY.  
AGREEMENT HERE COULD BE A MILESTONE  
IN U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS.

--WE ARE WORKING TOGETHER TOWARD  
A BAN ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL  
WARFARE AND THE ELIMINATION OF  
INVENTORIES OF THESE DESTRUCTIVE  
MATERIALS.

-- WE HAVE PROPOSED TO CURB THE  
SALES AND TRANSFER OF CONVENTIONAL

WEAPONS TO

WEAPONS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.

-- WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO HALT  
THE TREATENING PROLIFERATION OF  
NUCLEAR WEAPONS AMONG THE NATIONS  
OF THE WORLD.

-- WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN SERIOUS  
NEGOTIATIONS ON ARMS LIMITATIONS IN  
THE INDIAN OCEAN.

-- WE HAVE ENCOURAGED THE  
SOVIETS TO JOIN US IN SIGNING THE  
TREATY OF TLATELOLCO, WHICH WOULD BAN  
THE INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
INTO THE SOUTHERN PART OF THE WESTERN  
HEMISPHERE.

-- WE HAVE BEGUN REGULAR  
CONSULTATIONS WITH SOVIET LEADERS  
AS CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE GENEVA  
CONFERENCE TO PROMOTE PEACE IN THE  
MIDDLE EAST.

-- WE AND OUR ALLIES ARE  
NEGOTIATING TOGETHER WITH THE  
SOVIET UNION AND ITS ALLIES TO REDUCE  
THE LEVEL OF FORCES IN EUROPE.

-- WE HAVE RENEWED THE 1972  
AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION IN SCIENCE  
AND TECHNOLOGY AND A SIMILAR AGREEMENT  
FOR COOPERATION IN OUTER SPACE.

-- WE ARE SEEKING

-- WE ARE SEEKING WAYS TO COOPERATE  
IN IMPROVING WORLD HEALTH AND IN  
RELIEVING WORLD HUNGER.

IN THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION  
TALKS, CONFIRMING AND THEN BUILDING  
ON VLADIVOSTOK ACCORDS, WE NEED TO  
MAKE STEADY PROGRESS TOWARD OUR LONG-  
TERM GOALS OF GENUINE REDUCTIONS  
AND STRICT LIMITATIONS, WHILE  
MAINTAINING THE BASIC STRATEGIC  
BALANCE. WE HAVE OUTLINED PROPOSALS  
INCORPORATING SIGNIFICANT ELEMENTS  
OF ARMS CONTROL: DEEP REDUCTIONS IN  
THE ARSENALS OF BOTH SIDES, FREEZING

OF DEPLOYMENTS AND TECHNOLOGY, AND  
RESTRAINING CERTAIN ELEMENTS IN THE  
STRATEGIC POSTURE OF BOTH SIDES  
THAT THREATEN TO DESTABILIZE THE  
BALANCE WHICH NOW EXISTS,

THE VLADIVOSTOK NEGOTIATIONS OF  
1974 LEFT SOME ISSUES UNRESOLVED AND  
SUBJECT TO HONEST DIFFERENCES OF  
INTERPRETATION. MEANWHILE, NEW  
DEVELOPMENTS IN TECHNOLOGY HAVE CREATED  
NEW CONCERNS.

THE SOVIETS ARE WORRIED ABOUT  
OUR CRUISE MISSILES. WE ARE CONCERNED

ABOUT THE SECURITY

ABOUT THE SECURITY OF OUR DETERRENT.  
OUR CRUISE MISSILES ARE AIMED AT  
COMPENSATING FOR THE GROWING THREAT  
TO OUR DETERRENT CAPABILITY REPRESENTED  
BY THE BUILDUP OF SOVIET STRATEGIC  
OFFENSIVE WEAPONS FORCES. IF THESE  
THREATS CAN BE CONTROLLED, WE ARE  
PREPARED TO LIMIT OUR OWN STRATEGIC  
PROGRAMS.

BUT IF AN AGREEMENT CANNOT BE  
REACHED, THERE SHOULD BE NO DOUBT  
THAT THE UNITED STATES CAN AND WILL  
DO WHAT IT MUST TO PROTECT ITS SECURITY  
AND INSURE THE ADEQUACY OF ITS STRATEGIC  
POSTURE.

OUR NEW PROPOSALS GO BEYOND  
THOSE THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BEFORE.

[~~BUILDING ON PAST AGREEMENTS WE ARE  
TRYING TO REDUCE SUBSTANTIALLY THE  
EXISTING NUMBER OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.~~]

IN MANY AREAS WE ARE IN FACT  
ADDRESSING FOR THE FIRST TIME THE  
TOUGH, COMPLEX CORE OF LONGSTANDING  
PROBLEMS. WE ARE TRYING, FOR THE FIRST  
TIME, TO REACH AGREEMENTS THAT WILL NOT  
BE OVERTURNED BY THE NEXT TECHNOLOGICAL  
BREAKTHROUGH. WE ARE TRYING, IN A WORD,  
FOR GENUINE ACCOMMODATION.

NOT ONE OF THESE PROPOSALS INVOLVES  
A SACRIFICE OF SECURITY. ALL OF THEM  
ARE MEANT TO

ARE MEANT TO INCREASE THE SECURITY  
OF BOTH SIDES. OUR VIEW IS THAT A  
SALT AGREEMENT WHICH JUST REFLECTS  
THE LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR THAT  
CAN BE AGREED UPON WILL ONLY CREATE  
AN ILLUSION OF PROGRESS AND, EVENTUALLY,  
A BACKLASH AGAINST THE ENTIRE ARMS  
CONTROL PROCESS. OUR VIEW IS THAT  
GENUINE PROGRESS IN SALT WILL NOT  
MERELY STABILIZE COMPETITION IN  
WEAPONS, BUT CAN ALSO PROVIDE A BASIS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT IN POLITICAL RELATIONS.

WHEN I SAY THAT THESE EFFORTS  
ARE INTENDED TO RELAX TENSIONS, I AM  
NOT SPEAKING ONLY OF MILITARY SECURITY.

I MEAN AS WELL THE CONCERN AMONG OUR  
OWN CITIZENS THAT COMES FROM THE  
KNOWLEDGE THAT THE LEADERS OF OUR TWO  
COUNTRIES HAVE THE CAPACITY TO DESTROY  
HUMAN SOCIETY THROUGH MISUNDERSTANDINGS  
OR MISTAKES. IF WE CAN RELAX THIS  
TENSION BY REDUCING THE NUCLEAR  
THREAT, NOT ONLY WILL WE MAKE THE  
WORLD A SAFER PLACE, BUT WE WILL ALSO  
FREE OURSELVES TO CONCENTRATE ON  
CONSTRUCTIVE ACTION TO GIVE THE WORLD  
A BETTER LIFE.

WE HAVE MADE SOME PROGRESS TOWARD  
OUR GOALS. BUT, TO BE FRANK, WE ALSO

HEAR SOME

HEAR SOME NEGATIVE COMMENTS FROM THE  
SOVIET SIDE ABOUT SALT AND ABOUT OUR  
MORE GENERAL RELATIONS. IF THESE  
COMMENTS ARE BASED ON A MISCONCEPTION  
OF OUR MOTIVES, WE WILL REDOUBLE OUR  
EFFORTS TO MAKE THEM CLEAR; BUT IF  
THEY ARE MERELY DESIGNED AS PROPAGANDA  
TO PUT PRESSURE ON US, LET NO ONE  
DOUBT THAT WE WILL PERSEVERE.

WHAT MATTERS ULTIMATELY IS WHETHER  
WE CAN CREATE A RELATIONSHIP OF  
COOPERATION THAT WILL BE ROOTED IN  
THE NATIONAL INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES.  
WE SHAPE OUR OWN POLICIES TO ACCOMMODATE  
THE CHANGING WORLD, AND WE HOPE THE

SOVIETS WILL DO THE SAME. TOGETHER  
WE CAN GIVE THIS CHANGE A POSITIVE  
DIRECTION.

INCREASED TRADE BETWEEN THE  
UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION  
WOULD HELP US BOTH. THE AMERICAN-  
SOVIET JOINT COMMERCIAL COMMISSION  
HAS RESUMED ITS MEETINGS AFTER A LONG  
INTERLUDE. I HOPE THAT CONDITIONS  
CAN BE CREATED THAT WILL MAKE POSSIBLE  
STEPS TOWARD EXPANDED TRADE.

IN SOUTHERN AFRICA WE HAVE PRESSED  
FOR SOVIET AND CUBAN RESTRAINT.

THROUGHOUT THE

THROUGHOUT THE NON-ALIGNED WORLD, OUR  
GOAL IS NOT TO ENCOURAGE DISSENSION  
OR TO REDIVIDE THE WORLD INTO TWO  
OPPOSING IDEOLOGICAL CAMPS, BUT TO  
EXPAND THE REALM OF INDEPENDENT,  
ECONOMICALLY SELF-RELIANT NATIONS --  
AND TO OPPOSE ATTEMPTS AT NEW KINDS  
OF SUBJUGATION.

PART OF THE SOVIET LEADERS'  
CURRENT ATTITUDE MAY BE DUE TO THEIR  
APPARENT -- AND INCORRECT -- BELIEF  
THAT OUR CONCERN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IS  
AIMED SPECIFICALLY AT THEM OR IS AN  
ATTACK ON THEIR VITAL INTERESTS.

THERE ARE NO HIDDEN MEANINGS IN  
OUR COMMITMENT TO HUMAN RIGHTS. WE  
STAND ON WHAT WE HAVE SAID ON THIS  
SUBJECT BEFORE. OUR POLICY IS EXACTLY  
WHAT IT APPEARS TO BE: THE POSITIVE  
AND SINCERE EXPRESSION OF OUR DEEPEST  
BELIEFS AS A PEOPLE. IT IS ADDRESSED  
NOT TO ANY PARTICULAR PEOPLE OR AREA  
OF THE WORLD, BUT TO ALL COUNTRIES  
EQUALLY, INCLUDING OUR OWN. AND IT IS  
SPECIFICALLY NOT DESIGNED TO HEAT UP  
THE ARMS RACE OR BRING BACK THE COLD  
WAR.

ON THE CONTRARY, I BELIEVE THAT  
AN ATMOSPHERE OF PEACEFUL COOPERATION  
IS FAR MORE

IS FAR MORE CONDUCTIVE TO AN INCREASED  
RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS THAN AN  
ATMOSPHERE OF BELLIGERENCE OR WARLIKE  
CONFRONTATION. THE EXPERIENCE OF OUR  
CENTURY HAS PROVED THIS OVER AND OVER  
AGAIN.

WE HAVE NO ILLUSIONS THAT THE  
PROCESS WILL BE QUICK OR THAT CHANGE  
WILL COME EASILY. BUT WE ARE CONFIDENT  
THAT IF WE DO NOT ABANDON THE STRUGGLE  
THE CAUSE OF PERSONAL FREEDOM AND  
HUMAN DIGNITY WILL BE ENHANCED.

IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS, WE HAVE  
MADE CLEAR OUR DETERMINATION -- BOTH

TO GIVE VOICE TO AMERICANS'  
FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS, AND TO OBTAIN  
LASTING SOLUTIONS TO EAST-WEST  
DIFFERENCES. IF THIS CHANCE TO  
EMPHASIZE PEACE AND COOPERATION  
INSTEAD OF ANIMOSITY AND DIVISION IS  
ALLOWED TO PASS, IT WILL NOT HAVE BEEN  
OUR CHOICE.

WE MUST ALWAYS COMBINE REALISM  
WITH PRINCIPLE. OUR ACTIONS MUST BE  
FAITHFUL TO THE ESSENTIAL VALUES TO WHICH  
OUR SOCIETY IS DEDICATED, BECAUSE OUR  
FAITH IN THESE VALUES IS THE SOURCE OF  
OUR CONFIDENCE THAT THIS RELATIONSHIP WILL  
EVOLVE IN A MORE CONSTRUCTIVE DIRECTION.

I CANNOT

I CANNOT FORECAST WHETHER ALL OUR EFFORTS WILL SUCCEED. BUT THERE ARE THINGS WHICH GIVE ME HOPE, AND IN CONCLUSION I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION THEM BRIEFLY.

THIS PLACE WHERE I NOW STAND IS ONE OF THE OLDEST CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES. IT IS A BEAUTIFUL TOWN, OF WHOSE CULTURE AND URBAN CHARM ALL AMERICANS ARE PROUD -- JUST AS THE PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION ARE JUSTLY PROUD OF SUCH ANCIENT CITIES AS TBILISI OR NOVGOROD WHICH THEY LOVINGLY PRESERVE, AND INTO WHICH THEY INFUSE A NEW LIFE

33

THAT MAKES THESE CITIES FAR MORE THAN  
THE DEAD REMNANTS OF A GLORIOUS PAST.  
ALTHOUGH THERE ARE DEEP DIFFERENCES  
IN OUR VALUES AND IDEAS, WE AMERICANS  
AND RUSSIANS BELONG TO THE SAME  
CIVILIZATION WHOSE ORIGINS STRETCH BACK  
HUNDREDS OF YEARS.

BEYOND ALL THE DISAGREEMENTS  
BETWEEN US -- AND BEYOND THE COOL  
CALCULATIONS OF MUTUAL SELF-INTEREST  
THAT OUR TWO COUNTRIES BEING TO THE  
NEGOTIATING TABLE -- IS THE INVISIBLE  
HUMAN REALITY THAT MUST BRING US CLOSER  
TOGETHER. I MEAN THE YEARNING FOR

PEACE, REAL

PEACE, REAL PEACE, THAT IS IN THE VERY  
BONES OF US ALL. I AM ABSOLUTELY  
CERTAIN THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE  
SOVIET UNION, WHO HAVE SUFFERED SO  
GRIEVOUSLY IN WAR, FEEL THIS YEARNING.  
AND IN THIS THEY ARE AT ONE WITH THE  
PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. IT IS UP  
TO ALL OF US TO HELP MAKE THAT UNSPOKEN  
PASSION INTO SOMETHING MORE THAN  
A DREAM -- AND THAT RESPONSIBILITY  
FALLS MOST HEAVILY ON THOSE, LIKE  
PRESIDENT BREZHNEV AND MYSELF, WHO  
HOLD IN OUR HANDS THE TERRIBLE POWER  
CONFERRED BY MODERN ENGINES OF WAR.

MR. BREZHNEV SAID SOMETHING VERY  
INTERESTING RECENTLY. '' IT IS OUR  
BELIEF, OUR FIRM BELIEF,'' HE SAID,  
'' THAT REALISM IN POLITICS AND THE  
WILL FOR DETENTE AND PROGRESS WILL  
ULTIMATELY TRIUMPH AND MANKIND WILL  
BE ABLE TO STEP INTO THE 21ST CENTURY  
IN CONDITIONS OF PEACE STABLE AS NEVER  
BEFORE.'' I SEE NO HIDDEN MEANINGS  
IN THAT. I CREDIT ITS SINCERITY.  
AND I SHARE THE HOPE AND BELIEF IT  
EXPRESSES. WITH ALL THE DIFFICULTIES,  
ALL THE CONFLICTS, I BELIEVE THAT OUR  
PLANET MUST FINALLY OBEY THE BIBLICAL  
INJUNCTION TO '' FOLLOW AFTER THE  
THINGS WHICH MAKE FOR PEACE.''

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

rick--

one(?) of president's  
working drafts of south  
carolina speech

-- susan

7/20/77  
6:15 p.m.

JP ✓

I am proud to meet with you today, here in one of the most gracious of our nation's cities, to talk about the problems and the hopes that we, as Southerners and as Americans, all share.

I feel a special kinship with you as state legislators. For four years I was a member of the Georgia State Senate, and I still prize state government not only for the talents of those who work in it, but for its closeness to the people it represents. Our Southern states have a proud tradition of local, independent government, of which you are now the heirs.

But we in the South have also felt, perhaps more directly than many others, some of the rapid changes of the modern age. More and more our daily lives are shaped by events in other cities, decisions in other states, tensions in other parts of the world. As Americans, we cannot overlook the way our fate is bound to that of other nations. This interdependence stretches from the health of our economy to the security of our energy supplies. It is a new world, in which we cannot afford to be narrow in our vision, limited in our foresight, or selfish in our purpose.

When I took office, our nation was facing a series of problems around the world -- in Southern Africa, the Middle East, in our relations with our NATO allies, and on such

rights tough questions as nuclear proliferation, <sup>negotiations with our former adversaries,</sup> the Panama Canal <sup>a</sup> treaty, human and world poverty. We have <sup>openly and publicly these and other</sup> addressed difficult and controversial issues -- some of which have been <sup>skirted (hidden)</sup> [delayed] or avoided in the past. [As I pointed out in my most recent press conference, a period of debate, disagreement and probing was inevitable. ~~especially since, in all our foreign relations,~~ <sup>has not been</sup> Our goal is not to reach easy or transient agreements, but to find solutions that are meaningful, balanced, and lasting.

*Insert A*  
*delete*  
Today I want to discuss a vitally important aspect of these foreign relations, the one that will most directly shape the chances for peace for us and for our children. That is our relationship with the Soviet Union.

For decades, the central problems of our foreign policy revolved around antagonism between two coalitions, one headed by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union. Our national security was defined almost exclusively in terms of <sup>military</sup> competition with the USSR.

This competition is still critical, because it does involve issues which could lead to war. But however important this relationship <sup>of military balance,</sup> it cannot be our sole preoccupation to the exclusion of other world issues, <sup>which also concern us both. P</sup> Even if we succeed in relaxing tensions with the USSR, we could still awake one day to find that nuclear weapons have spread to dozens of

other nations. Or we could struggle to limit the arsenals of our two nations, in the name of reducing the danger of war, only to undo our efforts by continuing to export armaments to other nations, without restraint. As two industrial giants, we face long-term energy crises. Whatever our political differences, both of us are compelled to begin conserving world energy supplies and developing alternatives to oil and gas. Despite deep and continuing differences in world outlook, both of us should accept the new responsibilities imposed on us by the changing nature of international relations.

Other great changes have transformed the nature of the international drama. Europe and Japan rose from the rubble of war to become great economic powers. Communist parties and <sup>governments</sup> ~~nations~~ became more widespread and more varied. Newly independent nations merged into what has become known as the Third World. And the technological genius of mankind gave us the means of bringing the world's peoples closer together, and also ever more sophisticated and prolific weapons of destruction.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have learned that our countries and our peoples, in spite of great resources, are not all powerful. We have learned that this world, no matter how technology has shrunk its distances, is nevertheless

too large and too varied to come under the sway of either one or two great super powers. And -- what is perhaps most important -- we have, for our part, learned all of this in a spirit not of increasing resignation but of increasing maturity.

I mention these familiar changes because I think that to understand today's Soviet-American relationship we must place it in perspective, both historically and in terms of the overall global scene.

The whole history of Soviet-American relations teaches us that we will be misled if we base our long-range policies on the mood of the moment, whether that mood is euphoric or grim. All of us can remember times when relations seemed especially dangerous and times when they seemed bright. We have crossed those peaks and valleys before. And we can see that, on balance, the trend in the last third of a century has been positive.

The profound differences in what our two governments believe about freedom and power and the inner lives of human beings are likely to remain, and so are other elements of competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. That competition is real and deeply rooted in the history and values of our respective societies. But it is also true that our two countries share many important overlapping

interests. Our job is to explore those interests and use them to enlarge the areas of cooperation between us, on a basis of equality and mutual respect.

As we negotiate with the Soviet Union, we will be guided by a vision -- of a gentler, freer, more bountiful world. But we will have no illusions about the nature of the world as it really is. The basis for complete mutual trust does not yet exist. Therefore the agreements we reach must be anchored on each side in enlightened self-interest. That is why we search for areas of agreement where our real interests and those of the Soviets coincide.

We want to see the Soviets further engaged in the growing pattern of international activities designed to deal with human problems -- not only because they can be of real help, but also because we want them to have a greater stake in the creation of a constructive and peaceful world order.

When I took office -- exactly six months ago yesterday -- many Americans were growing disillusioned with detente -- and, by extension, with the whole course of our relations with the Soviet Union. World respect for the essential rightness of our foreign policy had been shaken by the events of a decade. At the same time, we were beginning to regain our sense of confidence and purpose as a nation.

? [ In this situation, I decided that it was <sup>time for</sup> ~~right for me to~~ ~~talk~~ <sup>honest discussions</sup> ~~talk honestly~~ about international issues with the American people.

I felt that it was urgent to restore the moral bearings of American foreign policy. And I felt that it was important to put the U.S.-soviet relationship, in particular, on a more

reciprocal, realistic, and ultimately more productive basis for both nations. It is not a question of a "hard" policy or a "soft" policy, but of a clear-eyed recognition of how most effectively to protect our security and to realize our long-term national interests. This is our goal.

We have looked at the problems in Soviet-American relations freshly, and have sought to deal with them boldly and constructively with proposals intended to produce concrete results:

-- In the talks on strategic arms limitations, we advanced a comprehensive proposal for genuine reductions, limitations, and a freeze on new technology which would maintain balanced strategic strength.

-- We have proposed a complete end to all nuclear tests and these negotiations are now underway. Agreement here could be a milestone in U.S.-Soviet relations.

-- We are working together toward a ban on chemical, biological, and radiological warfare and the elimination of inventories of these destructive materials.

-- We have proposed to curb the sales and transfer of conventional weapons to other countries.

-- We are attempting to halt the threatening proliferation of nuclear weapons among the nations of the world.

-- We have undertaken serious negotiations on arms limitations in the Indian Ocean.

-- We have encouraged the Soviets to join us in signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which would ban the introduction of nuclear weapons into the southern part of the Western Hemisphere.

-- We are continuing to consult with Soviet leaders as co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference to establish peace in the Middle East.

-- We and our allies are working together, with the Soviets, to reduce the level of armaments in Europe.

-- We have renewed the 1972 agreement for cooperation in science and technology and a similar agreement for cooperation in outer space.

-- We are seeking ways to cooperate in improving world health and in relieving world hunger.

\* \* \*

*See Note*  
In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks we need to  
[ratify [~~immediately~~] the terms on which [~~complete~~] agreement  
was reached at Vladivostok and also to] make steady progress  
toward our long-term goals of genuine reductions and strict  
limitations, while maintaining the basic strategic balance.  
We have outlined proposals incorporating significant elements  
of arms control: deep reductions in the arsenals of both sides,  
freezing of deployments and technology, and restraining  
certain elements in the strategic posture of both sides that  
threaten to destabilize the balance which now exists.

The Vladivostok negotiations of 1974 left some issues unresolved and subject to honest differences of interpretation. Meanwhile, new developments in technology have created new concerns.

The Soviets are worried about our cruise missiles. We are concerned about the security of our deterrent. Our cruise missiles are aimed at compensating for the growing threat to our deterrent capability represented by the buildup of Soviet strategic offensive weapons forces. If these threats can be controlled, we are prepared to limit ~~sharply~~ our own strategic programs.

But if an agreement cannot be reached, there should be no doubt that the United States ~~will~~ <sup>can and</sup> do what it must to protect its security and insure the adequacy of its strategic posture.

Our new proposals are different from those that have been made before. Building on Vladivostok, we are trying to reduce substantially the existing number of nuclear weapons.

In many areas we are in fact addressing <sup>for the first time</sup> the tough, complex core of longstanding problems. We are trying, for the first time, to reach agreements that will not be overturned by the next technological breakthrough. We are trying, in a word, for lasting peace.

Not one of these proposals involves a sacrifice of security. All of them are meant to increase the security of both sides. Our view is that a SALT agreement ~~cannot~~ which just reflect~~s~~ the lowest common denominator that can be agreed upon. ~~This~~ will create only an illusion of progress and, eventually, a backlash against the entire arms control process. Our view is that genuine progress in SALT will not merely stabilize competition in weapons, but ~~will~~ <sup>can</sup> also provide a basis for improvement in political relations.

When I say that these efforts are intended to relax tensions, I am not speaking only of military security. I mean as well the <sup>concern</sup> ~~tension~~ among <sup>our own citizens</sup> ~~individual people~~ that comes from the knowledge that the leaders of our two countries have the capacity to destroy human society through misunderstandings or mistakes. If we can relax this tension by reducing the nuclear threat, not only will we make the world a safer place, but we will also free ourselves to concentrate on constructive action to give the world a better life.

We have made some progress toward our goals. But, to be frank, we also hear some negative comments from the Soviet side about SALT and about our more general relations. If these comments are based on a misconception of our motives, we will redouble our efforts to make them clear; but if they

are merely designed as propaganda to put pressure on us, *let no one doubt*  
*that* we will persevere.

What matters ultimately is whether we can create a relationship of restraint and cooperation that will be rooted in the national interests of both sides. We shape our own policies to accommodate the changing world, and we hope the Soviets will do the same. Together we can give this change a positive direction.

Increased trade between the United States and the Soviet Union would help us both. The American-Soviet Joint Commercial Commission has resumed its meetings after a long interlude. I hope that conditions can be created that will make possible steps toward expanded trade.

In southern Africa we have pressed for Soviet and Cuban restraint. Throughout the non-aligned world, our goal is not to encourage dissension or to redivide the world into two opposing ideological camps, but to expand the realm of independent, economically self-sufficient nations -- and to oppose attempts at new kinds of subjugation.

Part of the Soviet leaders' current attitude may be due to their apparent -- and incorrect -- belief that our concern for human rights is aimed specifically at them or is an attack on their vital interests.

There are no hidden meanings in our commitment to human rights. ~~We~~ stand on what ~~we~~ have said on this subject before.

~~Our~~ <sup>our</sup> policy is exactly what it appears to be: the positive and sincere expression of our deepest beliefs as a people. It is addressed not to any particular people or area of the world, but to all countries equally, including our own. And it is specifically not <sup>designed</sup> ~~intended~~ to heat up the arms race or bring back the Cold War.

On the contrary, I believe that an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation is far more conducive to an increased respect for human rights than an atmosphere of belligerence or warlike confrontation. The experience of our century has proved this over and over again.

One of our problems is that H.R.  
there is to personally identified as you.

Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes

*to optimistic.*

We have no illusions that the process will be quick or that change will come easily. But we are confident that if we do not abandon the struggle the cause of personal freedom and human dignity will ~~prevail~~. *be enhanced.*

In ~~my first~~ <sup>the past</sup> six months ~~in office~~, we have made clear our determination -- both to give voice to Americans' fundamental beliefs, and to obtain lasting solutions to East-West differences. If this chance to emphasize peace and cooperation instead of animosity and division is allowed to pass, it will not have been our choice.

We must always combine realism with principle. Our actions must be faithful to the essential values to which our society is dedicated, because our faith in these values is the source of our confidence that this relationship will evolve in a more constructive direction.

I cannot forecast whether all our efforts will succeed. But there are things which give me hope, and in conclusion I would like to mention them briefly.

This place where I now stand is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is a beautiful town, of whose culture and urban charm all Americans are proud -- just as the peoples of the Soviet Union are justly proud of such ancient cities as Tbilisi or Novgorod which they lovingly preserve, and into which they infuse a new life that makes these cities far more than the dead remnants of a glorious past. Although there are deep differences in our values and

ideas, we Americans and Russians belong to the same civilization whose origins stretch back hundreds of years.

Beyond all the disagreements between us -- and beyond the cool calculations of mutual self-interest that our two countries bring to the negotiating table -- is the invisible human reality that must bring us closer together. I mean the yearning for peace, real peace, that is in the very bones of us all. I am absolutely certain that the people of the Soviet Union, who have suffered so grievously in war, feel this yearning. And in this they are at one with the people of the United States. It is up to all of us to help make that unspoken passion into something more than a dream -- and that responsibility falls most heavily on those, like President Brezhnev and myself, who hold in our hands the terrible power conferred by modern engines of war.

Mr. Brezhnev said something very interesting recently. "It is our belief, our firm belief," he said, "that realism in politics and the will for detente and progress will ultimately triumph and mankind will be able to step into the 21st century in conditions of peace stable as never before." I see no hidden meanings in that. I credit its sincerity. And I share the hope and belief it expresses. With all the difficulties, all the conflicts, I believe that our planet must finally obey the Biblical injunction to "follow after the things which make for peace."

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

SC:

This has been  
retyped - for  
files only -

Condyne

7/20/77  
11:30 a.m.

I am proud to meet with you today, here in one of the most gracious of our nation's cities, to talk about the problems and the hopes that we, as Southerners and as Americans, all share.

I feel a special kinship with you as state legislators. For four years I was a member of the Georgia State Senate, and I still prize state government not only for the talents of those who work in it, but for its closeness to the people it represents. Our Southern states have a proud tradition of local, independent government, of which you are now the heirs.

But we in the South have also felt, <sup>perhaps</sup> more directly than <sup>many others, some</sup> ~~anyone else in our nation~~ <sup>rapid</sup> ~~one~~ of the changes of the modern age. More and more our daily lives are shaped by events in other cities, decisions in other states, tensions in other parts of the world. As Americans, we cannot overlook the way our fate is bound to that of other nations. This interdependence stretches from the health of our economy to the security of our energy supplies. It is a new world, in which we cannot afford to be narrow in our vision, limited in our foresight, or selfish in our purpose.

When I took office, our nation was facing a series of problems around the world -- in Southern Africa, the Middle East, in our relations with our NATO allies, and on such

tough questions as nuclear proliferation, the Panama Canal, and world poverty. We have addressed difficult and controversial issues -- some of which have been delayed or avoided in the past. As I pointed out in my most recent press conference, a period of debate, disagreement and probing was inevitable -- especially since, in all our

foreign relations, our goal is not to reach ~~quick or easy or~~ <sup>transient</sup> agreements, but to find solutions that are <sup>meaningful</sup> balanced and <sup>transient</sup> lasting.

~~[mean something for the future as well as for the present]~~

Today I want to discuss a vitally important aspect of these foreign relations, the one that will most directly shape the chances for peace for us and for our children. That is our relationship with the Soviet Union.

For decades, the central problems of our foreign policy revolved around antagonism between two coalitions, one headed by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union. Our national security was defined almost exclusively in terms of competition with the USSR.

This ~~peaceful~~ competition is still critical, because it does involve issues of war and peace. But however important this relationship, it cannot be our sole preoccupation to the exclusion of other world issues. Even if we succeed in relaxing tensions with the USSR, we could still awake one day to find that nuclear weapons have spread to dozens of other

which could lead to war.

nations. Or we could struggle to limit the arsenals of our two nations, in the name of reducing the danger of war, only to undo our efforts by continuing to export armaments *to other nations* without restraint. As two industrial giants, <sup>*we*</sup> [both of us] face long-term energy crises. Whatever our political differences, both of us are compelled to begin conserving <sup>*world*</sup> [our] energy supplies and developing alternatives, <sup>*to oil and gas.*</sup> Despite deep and continuing differences in world outlook, both of us should accept the new responsibilities imposed on us by the changing nature of international relations.

Other great changes have transformed the nature of the international drama. Europe and Japan rose from the rubble of war to become great economic powers. Communist parties and nations became more widespread and more varied. Newly independent nations [e]merged into what has become known as the Third World. And the technological genius of mankind gave us [not only] <sup>*(and)*</sup> the means of bringing the world's peoples closer together, [but] also ever more sophisticated and prolific weapons of destruction.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have learned that our countries and our peoples, in spite of [our] great resources [and our political traditions,] are not [omnipotent] *all powerful.* We have learned that this world, no matter how technology has shrunk its distances, is nevertheless too large and too

varied to come under the sway of <sup>2, then one or</sup> two great super powers, ~~[let alone of one.]~~ And -- what is perhaps most important -- we have, for our part, learned all of this in a spirit not of increasing resignation but of increasing maturity.

I mention these familiar changes because I think that to understand today's Soviet-American relationship we must place it in perspective, both historically and in terms of the overall global scene.

The whole history of Soviet-American relations teaches us that we will be misled if we base our long-range <sup>Policies</sup> ~~[assess-~~ ~~ments]~~ on the mood of the moment, whether that mood is euphoric or grim. All of us can remember times when relations seemed especially dangerous and times when they seemed bright. We have crossed those peaks and valleys before. And we can see that, on balance, the trend in the last third of a century has been positive.

The profound differences in what our two governments believe about freedom and power and the inner lives of human beings <sup>are likely to</sup> ~~[will]~~ remain, and so <sup>are other elements</sup> ~~[will]~~ ~~the element]~~ of ~~[the]~~ competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. That competition is real and deeply rooted in <sup>the</sup> ~~history,~~ <sup>and values</sup> ~~philosophy,~~ <sup>of our respective societies</sup> ~~[and even psychology.]~~ But it is also true that our two countries <sup>share many</sup> ~~[have some]~~ important overlapping interests. Our job is to explore those interests and use them to enlarge the areas of cooperation between us, on a basis of equality and <sup>mutual</sup> ~~respect.~~

As we negotiate with the Soviet Union, we will be guided by a vision -- of a gentler, freer, more bountiful world. But we will have no illusions about the nature of the world as it really is. The basis for <sup>complete</sup> mutual trust does not <sup>yet</sup> ~~now~~ exist. Therefore the agreements we reach must be anchored on each side in enlightened self-interest. ~~[A measure of trust may someday grow out of that process, but trust cannot initiate it.]~~ That is why we search for areas <sup>of agreement</sup> where our real interests and <sup>those</sup> ~~the real interests~~ of the Soviets coincide.

We want to <sup>see</sup> ~~engage~~ the Soviets <sup>further engaged</sup> in the growing pattern of international activities designed to deal with ~~common~~ human problems -- not only because they can be of real help, but also because we want them to have a <sup>greater</sup> stake in the creation of a constructive <sup>and peaceful</sup> world order.

When I took office -- exactly six months ago yesterday -- many Americans were growing disillusioned with detente -- and, by, extension, with the whole course of our relations with the Soviet Union. <sup>World respect for the essential rightness of our foreign policy had been shaken by the events of a decade.</sup> At the same time, we were ~~regaining~~ <sup>beginning to regain</sup> our sense of confidence <sup>and purpose</sup> as a nation. <sup>decided that</sup>

In this situation, I ~~felt~~ it was right for me to talk honestly about international issues with the American people. I felt that it was urgent to restore the moral bearings of American foreign policy. And I felt that it was important to put the U.S.-Soviet relationship, in particular, on a more

reciprocal, realistic, and ultimately more productive basis <sup>for</sup> both nations.

It is not a question of a "hard" policy or a "soft" policy, but of a clear-eyed recognition of how most effectively to protect our security and to realize our long-term <sup>national</sup> interests.

This is <sup>our goal.</sup> ~~what I have sought.~~

We have looked at the problems in Soviet-American relations freshly, and have sought to deal with them boldly and constructively<sub>x</sub> with proposals intended to produce concrete results:

-- In the talks on strategic arms limitations, we advanced a comprehensive proposal for genuine reductions, limitations, and a freeze on new technology<sub>x</sub> which would maintain ~~lead to~~ balanced strategic strength.

-- We have ~~come out for~~ <sup>proposed</sup> a complete end to all nuclear tests and <sup>these</sup> negotiations ~~[to this end]~~ are now underway. Agreement here could be a ~~[major]~~ milestone in U.S.-Soviet relations.

-- We are working <sup>together</sup> toward a ban on chemical, <sup>biological, and radiological</sup> warfare and the elimination of ~~[all stocks]~~ <sup>inventories of these destructive materials</sup>.

-- We have proposed to curb the sales and transfer ~~of arms~~ <sup>Conventional weapons to other nations.</sup> countries.

-- We <sup>are attempting</sup> ~~[have proposed]~~ to halt the <sup>threatening</sup> proliferation of nuclear weapons<sub>x</sub> among the nations of the world.

-- We have undertaken serious negotiations on arms limitations in the Indian Ocean. ~~[We hope that these talks will lead to restrictions on the kinds of weapons in the area that most concern each side.]~~

*encouraged the Soviets to join us in signing*  
-- We have ~~[discussed]~~ ~~[Soviet adherence to]~~ the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which would ban the introduction of nuclear weapons into the <sup>southern part of the</sup> Western Hemisphere. *795*

-- ~~[In the Middle East]~~ We are continuing to consult with Soviet leaders as co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference ~~x~~ *to establish peace in the Middle East.*

-- In southern Africa we have pressed for Soviet <sup>and Cuban</sup> restraint. *encourage dissension*

*move to (B) p. 10*  
Throughout the non-aligned world, our goal is not to <sup>encourage dissension</sup> ~~redivide~~ the world into two opposing ideological camps, but to expand the realm of independent, economically self-sufficient nations -- and to oppose attempts at new kinds of subjugation.

~~[-- We would welcome constructive Soviet involvement in the dialogue between North and South.]~~

-- We and our allies are working together, with the Soviets, to reduce the level of armaments in Europe.

-- We have renewed the 1972 agreement for cooperation in science and technology and a similar agreement for cooperation in outer space.

*move to (C)*  
-- Increased trade between the United States and the Soviet Union would help us both. I hope <sup>that</sup> ~~the~~ conditions can be created that will make possible steps toward expanded trade. The American-Soviet Joint Commercial Commission has resumed its meeting after a long interlude.

*are seeking*  
-- We ~~[should also find]~~ ways to cooperate in improving world health and in relieving world hunger.

ratify immediately the terms  
on which complete agreement  
was reached at Vladivostok and  
also to

In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks we need to  
make steady progress toward our long-term goals of genuine  
reductions and strict limitations, <sup>while maintaining the basic strategic balance</sup> We have outlined  
proposals incorporating significant elements of arms  
control: deep reductions in the arsenals of both sides,  
freezing of deployments and technology, and restraining  
certain elements in the strategic posture of both sides  
that threaten to destabilize the balance, <sup>which now exists.</sup>

The Vladivostok negotiations of 1974 left some issues  
unresolved and subject to honest differences of inter-  
pretation. Meanwhile, new developments in technology have  
created new concerns.

~~The Soviets are worried about our  
cruise missiles. We are concerned about their very large  
total thousand of their intercontinental ballistic missile force &  
ballistic missiles which are being equipped with multiple  
warheads. We understand their interests. We want them to  
understand ours. We will continue to work for an agreement,  
built on Vladivostok, that clears up the unresolved issues  
and copes with the new technology.~~

clarifying  
the balance  
of our  
interests

(Handled  
Brown)

~~Our proposals are different from those that any  
Administration has made before. We are trying, for the first  
time, to reduce substantially the existing number of nuclear  
weapons. We are trying, for the first time, to bring about  
a complete end to all nuclear tests, and negotiations to this  
end are under way.] We are trying, for the first time, to  
reach agreements that will not be overturned by the next~~

Insert  
(A)  
or  
attach

Insert at (A)

The Soviets are worried about our cruise missiles. We are concerned about ~~[insuring]~~ the security of our deterrent. Our cruise missiles are aimed at compensating for the growing threat to our deterrent, <sup>capability</sup> represented by the buildup of Soviet strategic offensive weapons forces. If these threats can be controlled, we are prepared to sharply limit our own strategic programs.

But if an agreement cannot be reached, there should be no doubt that the United States will do what it must to protect its security and insure the adequacy of its strategic posture.

Our <sup>new</sup> proposals are different from those that ~~[any Administration has]~~ <sup>have been</sup> made before. Building on Vladivostok, we are trying to reduce substantially ~~[for the first time]~~ the existing number of nuclear weapons. ~~We are trying to work for lasting peace.~~

~~[We understand Soviet concerns and interests. We want them to understand ours. We are trying, for the first time, to bring about a complete end...]~~

In many areas we are in fact addressing the tough, complex core of longstanding problems.

V-P  
O'Brien  
28

technological breakthrough. We are trying, in a word, for lasting peace.

Not one of these proposals involves a sacrifice of ~~[our]~~ security. All of them are meant to increase the security of both sides. Our view is that a SALT agreement cannot just reflect the lowest common denominator that can be agreed upon. This will create only an illusion of progress and, eventually, a backlash against the entire arms control process. Our view is that genuine progress in SALT will not merely stabilize competition in weapons, but <sup>will also</sup> provide a basis for <sup>improvement</sup> ~~[a change]~~ in political relations.

When I say that these efforts are intended to relax tensions, I am not speaking only ~~[in the abstract diplomatic language]~~ of military security. I mean as well the <sup>tension among</sup> individual <sup>people</sup> ~~[human tension]~~ that comes from the knowledge that the leaders of our two countries have the capacity to destroy human society through misunderstandings or mistakes. If we can relax this tension <sup>by reducing the nuclear threats</sup>, not only will we make the world a safer place, but <sup>also</sup> ~~[also]~~ we will <sup>also</sup> free ourselves to concentrate on <sup>constructive action to give the world a better life.</sup> ~~[the things we should be doing.]~~

We have made some progress toward our goals. But, to be frank, we <sup>also have</sup> ~~[have also heard]~~ some negative comments from the Soviet side about SALT and about our <sup>more general</sup> relations <sup>more</sup> generally. If these comments are based on a misconception

redouble our efforts  
of our motives, we will ~~[do our utmost]~~ to make them clear;  
but if they are merely designed as propaganda to put pressure  
on us, we will persevere.

ultimately  
What matters ~~in the long run~~ is whether we can create  
a relationship of restraint and cooperation that will be  
rooted in the national interests of both sides. We ~~[are shape]~~  
~~adjusting~~ our own policies to accommodate the changing  
world, and we hope the Soviets will do the same. Together  
we can give this change a <sup>positive</sup> ~~[constructive]~~ direction.

~~[We must recognize that]~~ Part of the Soviet leaders'  
current attitude may be due to their apparent -- and  
incorrect -- belief that our concern for human rights is  
aimed specifically at them, <sup>or is an attack on their vital interests.</sup>

commitment to  
There are no hidden meanings in our ~~stand on~~ human  
rights. ~~It~~ is exactly what it appears to be: the positive  
and sincere expression of our deepest beliefs as a people.  
It is addressed not to any particular <sup>people</sup> country or <sup>area of the world,</sup> ~~[group of]~~  
~~countries]~~ but to all countries equally, including our own.  
And it is specifically not intended to heat up the arms race, <sup>or</sup>  
bring back the Cold War, <sup>or</sup> ~~[or try to dictate to any [country],~~  
~~including the [USSR] Soviet Union.]~~

On the contrary, I believe that an atmosphere of peace-  
ful cooperation is far more conducive to <sup>an increased respect for</sup> ~~[the gradual growth]~~  
~~of]~~ human rights than an atmosphere of belligerence or warlike

I stand on <sup>what</sup> ~~that~~ I have said on this subject before.  
My ~~new~~ policy is

confrontation. The experience of our century has proved this over and over again.

Our belief in human rights springs from the same source, the same vision of a better world, as do our beliefs in arms control and in international cooperation. Our ultimate aim, in each instance, is to raise the general level of human conduct, and to reduce the role that raw force plays in human affairs.

And just as our stand on human rights is not aimed at any particular country, neither is a public commitment to human rights the exclusive property of any particular country, including the United States. Such rights as the right to be protected from torture and arbitrary imprisonment and the right to speak as conscience directs are firmly rooted in international commitments. In Article VII of the Helsinki accords, for example, the participating countries pledge to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." We in the United States are willing to be judged by that standard.

We have no illusions that the process will be quick or that change will come easily. But we are confident that, <sup>if we do not</sup> ~~abandon the struggle~~ <sup>personal freedom and</sup> ~~in the course of months and years,~~ the cause of <sup>human</sup> dignity will <sup>not</sup> prevail.

In my first six months in office, <sup>we have made clear</sup> ~~my Administration~~ <sup>our determination</sup> ~~has gone beyond our predecessors~~ -- both ~~[in our willingness]~~ to give voice to Americans' fundamental beliefs, and ~~[in our determination]~~ to obtain lasting solutions to East-West differences. If this chance to emphasize <sup>peace and</sup> cooperation instead of <sup>animosity and division</sup> ~~competition~~ is allowed to pass, it will not have been our choice.

I can summarize the themes that will underlie our relations with the Soviet Union this way:

First, our policy must be based on the knowledge that our relationship with the Soviet Union is a complex one that will continue to involve both competitive concerns and overlapping interests. We can afford no illusions on this point.

Second, in the period immediately ahead, our most important objective must be to manage this relationship so as to reduce the danger that it might lead to nuclear war. We must do this by stabilizing the strategic military competition through negotiation and by regulating the political competition in crisis areas of the world.

Third, in the longer run, our aim is to encourage the Soviet Union to participate with us in constructive efforts to deal with the urgent problems that affect life on this planet.

Fourth, in each step we take with the Soviet Union, we must seek specific actions based upon mutual self-interest.

We must not allow rhetorical abstractions and passing moods to deflect us.

Finally, at every point, we must <sup>always</sup> combine realism with principle. Our actions must be faithful to the essential values to which our society is dedicated, because our faith in these values is the source of our confidence that this relationship will evolve in a more constructive direction.

I cannot forecast whether all our efforts will succeed. But there are things which give me hope, and in conclusion I would like to mention them briefly.

This place where I now stand is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is a beautiful town, of whose culture and urban charm all Americans are proud -- just as the peoples of the Soviet Union are justly proud of such ancient cities as Tbilisi or Novgorod which they lovingly preserve, and in<sup>to</sup> which they infuse a new life that makes these cities far more than the dead remnants of a glorious past. Although there are deep differences in our values and ideas, we Americans and Russians belong to the same civilization whose origins stretch back hundreds of years.

Beyond all the disagreements between us -- and beyond the cool calculations of mutual self-interest that our two countries bring to the negotiating table -- is the invisible human reality that must bring us closer together. I mean

the yearning for peace, real peace, that is in the very bones of us all. I am absolutely certain that the people of the Soviet Union, who have suffered so grievously in war, feel this yearning. And in this they are at one with the people of the United States. It is up to all of us to help make that unspoken passion into something more than a dream -- and that responsibility falls most heavily on those, like President Brezhnev and myself, who hold in <sup>our</sup> ~~their~~ hands the terrible power conferred by modern engines of war.

Mr. Brezhnev said something very interesting recently. "It is our belief, our firm belief," he said, "that realism in politics and the will for detente and progress will ultimately triumph~~y~~ and mankind will be able to step into the 21st century in conditions of peace stable as never before." I see no hidden meanings in that. I credit its sincerity. And I share the hope and belief it expresses. With all the difficulties, all the conflicts, I believe that our planet must finally obey the Biblical injunction to "follow after the things which make for peace."

# # #

**Electrostatic Copy Made  
for Preservation Purposes**

7/11/77  
7:30 a.m.

I am proud to meet with you today, here in one of the most gracious of our nation's cities, to talk about the problems and the hopes that we, as Southerners and as Americans, all share.

I feel a special kinship with you as state legislators. For four years I was a member of the Georgia State Senate, and I still prize state government not only for the talents of those who work in it, but for its closeness to the people it represents. Our Southern states have a proud tradition of local, independent government, of which you are now the heirs.

But we in the South have also felt, perhaps more directly than many others, some of the rapid changes of the modern age. More and more our daily lives are shaped by events in other cities, decisions in other states, tensions in other parts of the world. As Americans, we cannot overlook the way our fate is bound to that of other nations. This interdependence stretches from the health of our economy to the security of our energy supplies. It is a new world, in which we cannot afford to be narrow in our vision, limited in our foresight, or selfish in our purpose.

When I took office, our nation was facing a series of problems around the world -- in Southern Africa, the Middle East, in our relations with our NATO allies, and on such

tough questions as nuclear proliferation, negotiations with our former adversaries, a Panama Canal treaty, human rights and world poverty. We have openly and publicly addressed these and other difficult and controversial issues -- some of which have been skirted [hidden] or avoided in the past. As I pointed out in my most recent press conference, a period of debate, disagreement and probing was inevitable. Our goal has not been to reach easy or transient agreements, but to find solutions that are meaningful, balanced, and lasting.

A President has a responsibility to present to the people reports and summations of complex and important matters. Today I want to discuss a vitally important aspect of our foreign relations, the one that may most directly shape the chances for peace for us and for our children. I would like to spell out my view of what we have done and where we are going in our relations with the Soviet Union and to reaffirm the basic principles of our national policy.

For decades, the central problems of our foreign policy revolved around antagonism between two coalitions, one headed by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union. Our national security was defined almost exclusively in terms of military competition with the USSR.

This competition is still critical, because it does involve issues which could lead to war. But however important this relationship of military balance, it cannot be our sole preoccupation to the exclusion of other world issues which also concern us both.

Even if we succeed in relaxing tensions with the USSR, we could still awake one day to find that nuclear weapons have spread to dozens of other nations. Or we could struggle to limit the arsenals of our two nations, in the name of reducing the danger of war, only to undo our efforts by continuing without restraint to export armaments to other nations. As two industrial giants, we face long-term energy crises. Whatever our political differences, both of us are compelled to begin conserving world energy supplies and developing alternatives to oil and gas. Despite deep and continuing differences in world outlook, both of us should accept the new responsibilities imposed on us by the changing nature of international relations.

Other great changes have transformed the nature of the international drama. Europe and Japan rose from the rubble of war to become great economic powers. Communist parties and governments became more widespread

and more varied. Newly independent nations merged into what has become known as the Third World. And the technological genius of mankind gave us the means of bringing the world's peoples closer together, and also ever more sophisticated and prolific weapons of destruction.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have learned that our countries and our peoples, in spite of great resources, are not all powerful. We have learned that this world, no matter how technology has shrunk its distances, is nevertheless

too large and too varied to come under the sway of either one or two great super powers. And -- what is perhaps most important -- we have, for our part, learned all of this in a spirit not of increasing resignation but of increasing maturity.

I mention these familiar changes because I think that to understand today's Soviet-American relationship we must place it in perspective, both historically and in terms of the overall global scene.

The whole history of Soviet-American relations teaches us that we will be misled if we base our long-range policies on the mood of the moment, whether that mood is euphoric or grim. All of us can remember times when relations seemed especially dangerous and times when they seemed bright. We have crossed those peaks and valleys before. And we can see that, on balance, the trend in the last third of a century has been positive.

The profound differences in what our two governments believe about freedom and power and the inner lives of human beings are likely to remain, and so are other elements of competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. That competition is real and deeply rooted in the history and values of our respective societies. But it is also true that our two countries share many important overlapping

interests. Our job is to explore those interests and use them to enlarge the areas of cooperation between us, on a basis of equality and mutual respect.

As we negotiate with the Soviet Union, we will be guided by a vision -- of a gentler, freer, more bountiful world. But we will have no illusions about the nature of the world as it really is. The basis for complete mutual trust does not yet exist. Therefore the agreements we reach must be anchored on each side in enlightened self-interest. That is why we search for areas of agreement where our real interests and those of the Soviets coincide.

We want to see the Soviets further engaged in the growing pattern of international activities designed to deal with human problems -- not only because they can be of real help, but also because we want them to have a greater stake in the creation of a constructive and peaceful world order.

When I took office -- exactly six months ago yesterday -- many Americans were growing disillusioned with detente -- and, by extension, with the whole course of our relations with the Soviet Union. World respect for the essential rightness of our foreign policy had been shaken by the events of a decade. At the same time, we were beginning to regain our sense of confidence and purpose as a nation.

In this situation, I decided that it was time for honest discussions about international issues with the American people. I felt that it was urgent to restore the moral bearings of American foreign policy. And I felt that it was important to put the U.S.-soviet relationship, in particular, on a more

reciprocal, realistic, and ultimately more productive basis for both nations. It is not a question of a "hard" policy or a "soft" policy, but of a clear-eyed recognition of how most effectively to protect our security and to realize our long-term national interests. This is our goal.

We have looked at the problems in Soviet-American relations freshly, and have sought to deal with them boldly and constructively with proposals intended to produce concrete results:

-- In the talks on strategic arms limitations, we advanced a comprehensive proposal for genuine reductions, limitations, and a freeze on new technology which would maintain balanced strategic strength.

-- We have proposed a complete end to all nuclear tests and these negotiations are now underway. Agreement here could be a milestone in U.S.-Soviet relations.

-- We are working together toward a ban on chemical, biological, and radiological warfare and the elimination of inventories of these destructive materials.

-- We have proposed to curb the sales and transfer of conventional weapons to other countries.

-- We are attempting to halt the threatening proliferation of nuclear weapons among the nations of the world.

-- We have undertaken serious negotiations on arms limitations in the Indian Ocean.

-- We have encouraged the Soviets to join us in signing the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which would ban the introduction of nuclear weapons into the southern part of the Western Hemisphere.

-- We are continuing to consult with Soviet leaders as co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference to establish peace in the Middle East.

-- We and our allies are working together, with the Soviets, to reduce the level of armaments in Europe.

-- We have renewed the 1972 agreement for cooperation in science and technology and a similar agreement for cooperation in outer space.

-- We are seeking ways to cooperate in improving world health and in relieving world hunger.

\* \* \*

In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks we need to ratify the terms on which agreement was reached at Vladivostok and also to make steady progress toward our long-term goals of genuine reductions and strict limitations, while maintaining the basic strategic balance. We have outlined proposals incorporating significant elements of arms control: deep reductions in the arsenals of both sides, freezing of deployments and technology, and restraining certain elements in the strategic posture of both sides that threaten to destabilize the balance which now exists.

The Vladivostok negotiations of 1974 left some issues unresolved and subject to honest differences of interpretation. Meanwhile, new developments in technology have created new concerns.

The Soviets are worried about our cruise missiles. We are concerned about the security of our deterrent. Our cruise missiles are aimed at compensating for the growing threat to our deterrent capability represented by the buildup of Soviet strategic offensive weapons forces. If these threats can be controlled, we are prepared to limit our own strategic programs.

But if an agreement cannot be reached, there should be no doubt that the United States can and will do what it must to protect its security and insure the adequacy of its strategic posture.

Our new proposals are different from those that have been made before. Building on Vladivostok, we are trying to reduce substantially the existing number of nuclear weapons.

In many areas we are in fact addressing for the first time the tough, complex core of longstanding problems. We are trying, for the first time, to reach agreements that will not be overturned by the next technological breakthrough. We are trying, in a word, for lasting peace.

Not one of these proposals involves a sacrifice of security. All of them are meant to increase the security of both sides. Our view is that a SALT agreement which just reflects the lowest common denominator that can be agreed upon will only create an illusion of progress and, eventually, a backlash against the entire arms control process. Our view is that genuine progress in SALT will not merely stabilize competition in weapons, but can also provide a basis for improvement in political relations.

When I say that these efforts are intended to relax tensions, I am not speaking only of military security. I mean as well the concern among our own citizens that comes from the knowledge that the leaders of our two countries have the capacity to destroy human society through misunderstandings or mistakes. If we can relax this tension by reducing the nuclear threat, not only will we make the world a safer place, but we will also free ourselves to concentrate on constructive action to give the world a better life.

We have made some progress toward our goals. But, to be frank, we also hear some negative comments from the Soviet side about SALT and about our more general relations. If these comments are based on a misconception of our motives, we will redouble our efforts to make them clear; but if they

are merely designed as propaganda to put pressure on us, let no one doubt that we will persevere.

What matters ultimately is whether we can create a relationship of restraint and cooperation that will be rooted in the national interests of both sides. We shape our own policies to accommodate the changing world, and we hope the Soviets will do the same. Together we can give this change a positive direction.

Increased trade between the United States and the Soviet Union would help us both. The American-Soviet Joint Commercial Commission has resumed its meetings after a long interlude. I hope that conditions can be created that will make possible steps toward expanded trade.

In southern Africa we have pressed for Soviet and Cuban restraint. Throughout the non-aligned world, our goal is not to encourage dissension or to redivide the world into two opposing ideological camps, but to expand the realm of independent, economically self-sufficient nations -- and to oppose attempts at new kinds of subjugation.

Part of the Soviet leaders' current attitude may be due to their apparent -- and incorrect -- belief that our concern for human rights is aimed specifically at them or is an attack on their vital interests.

There are no hidden meanings in our commitment to human rights. We stand on what we have said on this subject before. Our policy is exactly what it appears to be: the positive and sincere expression of our deepest beliefs as a people. It is addressed not to any particular people or area of the world, but to all countries equally, including our own. And it is specifically not designed to heat up the arms race or bring back the Cold War.

On the contrary, I believe that an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation is far more conducive to an increased respect for human rights than an atmosphere of belligerence or warlike confrontation. The experience of our century has proved this over and over again.

We have no illusions that the process will be quick or that change will come easily. But we are confident that if we do not abandon the struggle the cause of personal freedom and human dignity will be enhanced.

In the past six months, we have made clear our determination -- both to give voice to Americans' fundamental beliefs, and to obtain lasting solutions to East-West differences. If this chance to emphasize peace and cooperation instead of animosity and division is allowed to pass, it will not have been our choice.

We must always combine realism with principle. Our actions must be faithful to the essential values to which our society is dedicated, because our faith in these values is the source of our confidence that this relationship will evolve in a more constructive direction.

I cannot forecast whether all our efforts will succeed. But there are things which give me hope, and in conclusion I would like to mention them briefly.

This place where I now stand is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is a beautiful town, of whose culture and urban charm all Americans are proud -- just as the peoples of the Soviet Union are justly proud of such ancient cities as Tbilisi or Novgorod which they lovingly preserve, and into which they infuse a new life that makes these cities far more than the dead remnants of a glorious past. Although there are deep differences in our values and

ideas, we Americans and Russians belong to the same civilization whose origins stretch back hundreds of years.

Beyond all the disagreements between us -- and beyond the cool calculations of mutual self-interest that our two countries bring to the negotiating table -- is the invisible human reality that must bring us closer together. I mean the yearning for peace, real peace, that is in the very bones of us all. I am absolutely certain that the people of the Soviet Union, who have suffered so grievously in war, feel this yearning. And in this they are at one with the people of the United States. It is up to all of us to help make that unspoken passion into something more than a dream -- and that responsibility falls most heavily on those, like President Brezhnev and myself, who hold in our hands the terrible power conferred by modern engines of war.

Mr. Brezhnev said something very interesting recently. "It is our belief, our firm belief," he said, "that realism in politics and the will for detente and progress will ultimately triumph and mankind will be able to step into the 21st century in conditions of peace stable as never before." I see no hidden meanings in that. I credit its sincerity. And I share the hope and belief it expresses. With all the difficulties, all the conflicts, I believe that our planet must finally obey the Biblical injunction to "follow after the things which make for peace."

7/19/77

## INTRODUCTION

I am proud to meet with you today, here in one of the oldest and most pleasant of our nation's cities, to talk about the problems and the hopes that we, as Southerners and as Americans, all share.

I feel a special kinship with you as state legislators. For four years I was a member of the Georgia State Senate, and I still prize state government not only for the talents of those who work in it, but for its closeness to the people it represents. Our Southern states have a proud tradition of local, independent government, of which you are now the heirs.

But we in the South have also felt, more directly than anyone else in our nation, one of the changes of the modern age. More and more our daily lives are shaped by events in other cities, decisions in other states, tensions in other parts of the world. As Americans, we cannot overlook the way our fate is bound to that of other nations. This interdependence stretches from the health of our economy to the security of our energy supplies. It is a new world, in which we cannot afford to be narrow in our vision, limited in our foresight, or selfish in our purpose.

Today I want to discuss perhaps the most important of these foreign relations, the one that will most directly shape the chances for peace for us and for our children. That is our relationship with the Soviet Union.

For decades, the central problems of our foreign policy revolved around antagonism between two coalitions, one headed by the U. S. and the other by the Soviet Union. Our national security was defined almost exclusively in terms of competition with the USSR.

This competition is still critical, because it does involve issues of war and peace. But it should not dominate our policy, to the detriment of other world issues. Even if we succeed in relaxing tensions with the USSR, we could still awake one day to find that nuclear weapons have spread to dozens of other nations. Or we could struggle to limit the fearsome arsenals of our two nations, in the name of reducing the danger of war, only to undo our efforts by continuing to export <sup>many</sup> armaments, <sup>to other</sup> As two industrial giants, both of us face long-term energy crises. Whatever our political differences, both of us are compelled to begin conserving our energy supplies and developing alternatives. Despite deep and continuing differences in world outlook, both of us should accept the new responsibilities imposed on us by the changing nature of international relations.

Other great changes have transformed the nature of the international drama. Europe and Japan rose from the rubble of war to become great economic powers. Communist

parties and nations became more widespread and more varied. Newly independent nations emerged into what has become known as the Third World. And the technological genius of mankind gave us not only the means of bringing the world's peoples closer together, but also ever more sophisticated and prolific weapons of destruction.

We have learned that our country and our people, in spite of our great resources and our political tradition, are not omnipotent. We have learned that this world, no matter how technology has shrunk its distances, is still too large and too varied to come under the sway of two dominating super powers, let alone of one. And -- what is perhaps most important -- we have learned all of this in a spirit not of increasing resignation but of increasing maturity.

I mention these familiar changes because I think that to understand today's Soviet-American relationship we must place it in perspective, both historically and in terms of the overall global scene.

The whole history of Soviet-American relations teaches us that we will be misled if we base our long-range assessments on the mood of the moment, whether that mood is euphoric or grim. All of us can remember times when relations seemed especially dangerous and times when they

seemed bright. We have crossed those peaks and valleys before. And we can see that, on balance, the trend in the last third of a century has been positive.

<sup>Some ?</sup>  
The profound differences in what our two governments believe about freedom and power and the inner lives of human beings -- differences that are rooted in the histories and values of each of our societies -- will remain, and so will the element of the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. But the mutual interests that our two countries share are every bit as real. Our job is to explore those mutual interests and use them to enlarge the areas of cooperation.

As we negotiate with the Soviet Union, we will be guided by a vision -- of a gentler, freer, more bountiful world. But the agreements we reach must be anchored on each side by self-interest. Trust may grow out of that process, but trust cannot initiate it. That is why we search for areas where our real interests and the real interests of the Soviets coincide. ?

We want to engage the Soviets in the growing pattern of international activities designed to deal with common human problems -- not only because they can be of real help, but also because we want them to have a stake in the creation of a constructive world order.

When I took office -- exactly six months ago yesterday -- many Americans were growing disillusioned with detente -- and, by, extension, with the whole course of our relations with the Soviet Union.

In this situation, I felt it was right for me to talk honestly about international issues with the American people. I felt that it was urgent to restore the moral bearings of American foreign policy. And I felt that it was important to put the U.S.-Soviet relationship, in particular, on a more realistic and ultimately more productive basis. This is what I have sought to do.

> We have already taken the initiative in putting forth bold, sometimes unprecedented proposals in many areas of Soviet-American relations:

-- We have proposed a ban on chemical warfare and the elimination of all stocks;

-- We have proposed to curb the sales and transfer of arms;

-- We have proposed to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons;

-- and we have proposed arms restraint in the Indian Ocean.

36.9  
Version  
But our major effort has been the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Our country has had many negotiations over the years with the Soviet Union, but none has come

close to approaching the importance of SALT. Since the creation of the atomic bomb, nuclear weapons have proliferated in the tens of thousands. Any one of them could destroy a city; a fraction of them could destroy our

*question* [world.]

When I say that these talks are intended to relax tensions, I am not speaking only in the abstract diplomatic language of military security. I mean as well the individual human tension that comes from the knowledge that the leaders of our two countries have the capacity to destroy human society through misunderstanding or mistake. If we can relax this tension, not only will we make the world a safer place, but also we will free ourselves to concentrate on the things we should be doing.

In SALT we need to make steady progress toward our long-term goals of genuine reductions and strict limitations. We have outlined proposals incorporating significant elements of arms control: deep reductions in the arsenals of both sides, freezing of deployments and technology, and restraining certain elements in the strategic posture of both sides that threaten to destabilize the balance.

Our proposals are different from those that any Administration has made before. We are trying, for the first time, to reduce the existing number of nuclear weapons.

We are trying, for the first time, to bring about a complete end to all nuclear tests, without political conditions, and negotiations to this end are under way. We are trying, for the first time, to reach agreements that will not be overturned by the next technological breakthrough. We are trying, in a word, for lasting peace.

Not one of these proposals involves a sacrifice of our security. All of them are meant to increase the security of both sides. Our view is that a SALT agreement cannot just reflect the lowest common denominator that can be agreed upon. This will create only an illusion of progress and, eventually, a backlash against the entire arms control process. Our view is that genuine progress in SALT will not merely stabilize competition in weapons, but provide a basis for a change in political relations.

There are many other areas in which we wish to make progress. We have discussed Soviet adherence to the Treaty of

Tlatelolco, banning the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Western Hemisphere.

In the Middle East we are continuing to consult with Soviet leaders. In southern Africa we have counseled Soviet restraint. We would welcome Soviet help in resolving the disputes between North and South.

We have renewed the 1972 agreement for cooperation in science and technology and a similar agreement for cooperation in outer space. The American-Soviet Joint Commercial Commission has resumed its meeting after a long interlude. We should also find ways to cooperate in improving world health and in relieving world hunger.

We have made some progress toward our goals. But, to be frank, we have also heard some negative comments from the Soviet side about SALT and about our relations more generally.

If these comments are based on a misconception of our motives, we will do our utmost to make them clear; if they are designed to put pressure on us as part of the negotiating process, we will persevere.

What matters in the long run is whether we can create a relationship of restraint and cooperation that will be rooted in the national interests of both sides. We are adjusting our own policies to accommodate the changing world, and we hope the Soviets will do the same. Together we can give this change a constructive direction.

not  
back  
down

We must recognize that part of the Soviet leaders' current attitude may be due to their apparent -- and incorrect -- belief that our concern for human rights is aimed specifically at them.

There are no hidden meanings in our stand on human rights. It is exactly what it appears to be: the positive and sincere expression of our deepest beliefs as a people. It is addressed not to any particular country or group of countries, but to all countries equally, including our own. And it is specifically not intended to heat up the arms race, bring back the Cold War, or try to dictate to any country, including the USSR.

On the contrary, I believe that an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation is far more conducive to the gradual growth of human rights than an atmosphere of belligerence or warlike confrontation. The experience of our century has proved this over and over again.

?

Our belief in human rights springs from the same source, the same vision of a better world, as do our beliefs in arms control and in international cooperation. Our ultimate aim, in each instance, is to raise the general level of human conduct, and to reduce the role that raw, brutal force plays in human affairs.

And just as our stand on human rights is not aimed at any particular country, neither is a public commitment to human rights the exclusive property of any particular country, including the United States. Such rights as the right to be protected from torture and arbitrary imprisonment and the right to speak as conscience directs are firmly rooted in international commitments. In Article VII of the Helsinki accords, for example, the participating countries pledge to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." We in the United States are willing to be judged by that standard.

In my first six months in office, my Administration has gone beyond our predecessors -- both in our willingness to give voice to Americans' fundamental beliefs, and in our determination to obtain lasting solutions to East-West differences. If this chance to emphasize cooperation instead of competition is allowed to pass, it will not have been our choice.

I can summarize the principles that will guide our relations with the Soviet Union this way:

First, our policy must be based on the knowledge that our relationship with the Soviet Union is a complex one that will continue to involve both competitive concerns and common interests. We can afford no illusions on this point.

Second, in the period immediately ahead, our most important objective must be to manage this relationship so as to reduce the danger that it might lead to nuclear war. We must do this by stabilizing the strategic military competition through negotiation and by regulating the political competition in crisis areas of the world.

Third, in the longer run, our aim is to encourage the Soviet Union to participate with us in constructive efforts to deal with the urgent problems that affect life on this planet.

Fourth, in each step we take with the Soviet Union, we must seek specific actions based upon mutual self-interest. We must not allow rhetorical abstractions and passing moods to deflect us.

Finally, at every point, we must combine realism with principle. Our actions must be faithful to the essential values to which our society is dedicated, because our faith in these values is the source of our confidence that this relationship will evolve in a more constructive direction.

I cannot forecast whether all our efforts will succeed. But there are things which give me hope, and in conclusion I would like to mention them briefly.

This place where I now stand is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is a beautiful town, of whose culture and urban charm all Americans are proud -- just as the peoples of the Soviet Union are justly proud of such ancient cities as Tbilisi or Novgorod which they lovingly preserve, and in which they infuse a new life that makes these cities far more than the dead remnants of a glorious past. Although there are deep differences in our values and ideas, we Americans and Russians belong to the same civilization whose origins stretch back hundreds of years. 2

Beyond all the disagreements between us -- and beyond the cool calculations of mutual self-interest that our two countries bring to the negotiating table -- is the invisible human reality that must bring us closer together. I mean the yearning for peace, real peace, that is in the very bones of us all. I am absolutely certain that the people of the Soviet Union, who have suffered so grievously in war, feel this yearning. And in this they are at one with the people of the United States. It is up to all of us to help make that unspoken passion into something more than a dream -- and that responsibility falls most heavily on those, like President Brezhnev and myself, who hold in their hands the terrible power conferred by modern engines of war.

Mr. Brezhnev said something very interesting recently. "It is our belief, our firm belief," he said, "that realism in politics and the will for detente and progress will ultimately triumph and mankind will be able to step into the 21st century in conditions of peace stable as never before." I see no hidden meanings in that. I credit its sincerity. And I share the hope and belief it expresses. With all the difficulties, all the conflicts, I believe that our planet must finally obey the Biblical injunction to "follow after the things which make peace."

# # #